DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 415 069 RC 021 339

AUTHOR de Reuse, Willem J.
TITLE Issues in Language Textbook Development: The Case of Western Apache.
PUB DATE 1997-00-00
NOTE 14p.; In: Teaching Indigenous Languages; see RC 021 328.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS American Indian Education; *American Indian Languages; *Apache; Elementary Secondary Education; *Language Maintenance; Learning Strategies; Linguistics; *Second Language Instruction; Teaching Methods; *Textbook Preparation; *Textbooks
IDENTIFIERS Total Physical Response

ABSTRACT

Two experimental language-learning textbooks were developed in collaboration with Apache-speaking scholars from the San Carlos and White Mountain Reservations. One was written in the grammar-translation tradition and modeled after successful textbooks for Navajo and Papago. While the text's main purpose is to teach elementary conversational Western Apache with some emphasis on reading and writing, it also teaches some of the linguistics of Western Apache to Apache students and speakers. Educators can apply linguistics knowledge to contrast the languages in bilingual situations and as a tool for teaching children about scientific inquiry (analyzing their own intuitive knowledge of language rules). Also, exposure to linguistics may spark some Native American students to enter the field and apply themselves to the problems of endangered Native languages. The other textbook is a guide to teaching Apache with the Total Physical Response (TPR) method, based on Asher's (1982) teacher's guidebook. The approaches of the two textbooks raise various problems that can be partially solved by combining approaches. For example, classificatory handling verbs are best taught by a grammar-translation method, supplemented by TPR-style exercises; straightforward syntactic structures (in Apache), such as negation and yes/no questions, can be taught through TPR exercises, supplemented by grammatical explanations. In addition, native experts should monitor any text to avoid culturally sensitive or politically inappropriate material. Finally, a dialogue between linguists and native experts is needed to decide how much linguistic terminology can be handled in each curriculum. Contains 45 references. (Author/SV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 415 069

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jon Reyhner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Issues in Language Textbook Development: The Case of Western Apache

Willem J. de Reuse

Two experimental language learning textbooks were developed in collaboration with Apache speaking scholars from the San Carlos and White Mountain reservations. One was written in the grammar-translation tradition and modeled after Wilson's Conversational Navajo Workbook and Zepeda's Papago Grammar. The other text was a guide to teaching Apache with the Total Physical Response (TPR) method, based on Asher's (1982) teacher's guidebook. Both approaches raised a variety of problems that can be partially solved by a judicious combination of the two approaches. For example, the classificatory handling verbs are best taught by a grammar-translation method, supplemented by TPR style exercises; straightforward syntactic structures (at least in Apache), such as negation, and yes-no questions, can be taught through TPR exercises and supplemented by grammatical explanations. Additionally, native experts should monitor any text to avoid culturally sensitive or politically inappropriate material. Finally, a dialogue between linguists and native experts needs to be established in order to decide how much linguistic terminology can be handled in each particular curriculum.

Let me start with a few general remarks about the development of language textbooks as an effective language renewal practice. We all know intuitively that books have never been efficient and sufficient aids towards language renewal. However, Hebrew would never have been revived as a first language if it was not for generation upon generation of Jewish scholars learning the language from books. Then again, Native American cultures (with the exception of Maya culture) are not book cultures in the way Western culture is and therefore are justified in being suspicious of books as possible instruments of Western Imperialism. But, Native American cultures, as cultures have always done, have successfully adopted and integrated foreign cultural elements to their benefit. Examples would be the pickup truck for more efficient transportation and, more recently, the computer as a possible educational tool. Would it be wise to rely heavily on computer technology for language preservation? The point that I am trying to make is that we can go back and forth arguing about whether textbooks are good tools for language renewal, and we will probably never convince many people that they are useful. What I propose is that we start writing textbooks, knowing full well that they will only be useful to some learners, and only part of the time.

RC 021339

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

There is no doubt, as has often been said at previous meetings of this Symposium, that the best way towards achieving successful language renewal is to convince parents (and grandparents) to speak the language and nothing but the language to their children. No textbook, no school curriculum program is ever going to replace this. However, if we are going to have second language curricula and second language textbooks, we should want to make them as efficient and attractive as we can.

Three kinds of language textbooks

A few general remarks about the language teaching textbook situation for Native American languages in the United States are in order. It is useful to distinguish between three kinds of texts: there exist 1) textbooks that teach Native speakers something about the grammar of the language, or teach them to read and write, but do not teach the speaking and listening skills necessary for oral communication; 2) second language textbooks that teach the language to speakers of other languages but avoid grammar to some extent; and 3) textbooks that try to do a little bit of both, i.e., they teach the language, but at the same time try to be of interest to Native speakers or linguists by teaching something about the grammar. It is my impression that in the United States, Type 1 textbooks are not very common and often unpublished, while Type 2 and 3 textbooks are more common, Type 2 being more often published than Type 3. Let me illustrate this situation with Navajo textbooks below. References with dates followed by asterisks are unpublished; complete references are given at the end of this paper.

Type 1 textbooks:

Hale (1970-75)*
Hale et al. (1977)*
Platero et al. (1985)
Faltz (1993)*[1]

Type 2 textbooks:

Blair et. al. (1969)
Goossen (1977)
Goossen (1995)
Wilson (1969)
Wilson & Dennison (1978)

Within Type 2, one can further distinguish those texts that provide very little grammatical discussion (Wilson, 1969, Wilson & Dennison, 1978), to those who provide a fair amount of grammar, particularly Goossen (1995), which approaches the amount provided in Type 3 texts. There are probably other Type 2 materials, such as for L.D.S. (Mormon) missionaries, that I am unaware of.

[1]A special case because it deals with the Navajo verb only.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Type 3 textbooks:

Haile (1941-1948)
Pinnow (1974)*[1]
Willie (1994)*
Wilson (1995)
Witherspoon et al. (1985)
Witherspoon et al. (1986)

The other Native languages of the United States do not have this profusion of materials, even though other languages, such as Lakota, might outdo Navajo in terms of unpublished materials (see my bibliographies, de Reuse 1987, 1990).

In Arizona, there is something available for all the Uto-Aztecan languages: Hopi has one Type 1 text (Masayesva-Jeanne & Hale, 1976), three Type 3 textbooks, one published (Kalectaca & Langacker, 1978) and two unpublished (Sekaquaptewa & Shaul, 1974-1977; Sekaquaptewa & Hill, 1995); Yaqui has one Type 2 text (Molina, 1995), not counting the beautiful materials produced for young speakers in Sonora, Mexico. O'odham (Pima-Papago) has one Type 1 text (Willenbrink, 1935) and one Type 3 text (Zepeda, 1983), and I suspect there are unpublished materials for the Uto-Aztecan languages of Arizona that I am not aware of. I need more information about the Yuman languages of Arizona.

Western Apache language textbooks

As first noted by Lewis (1989), the prognosis for the survival of Western Apache is not good. Very few parents speak the language to their preschool children. In San Carlos and Whiteriver, the largest towns on the San Carlos and White Mountain Apache Reservations respectively, kindergarten playgrounds appear to be very much monolingual in English. Even though it is politically incorrect to say so, the Western Apache language is endangered and drastic steps will have to be taken to preserve and renew it. In her own presentation in this volume, Bernadette Adley-SantaMaria, who is a native speaker and wrote a master's thesis on White Mountain Apache language shift, will provide more detail about the present-day sociolinguistic situation among the White Mountain Apache.

Below are listed textbook materials for Western Apache, not including my own recent work in collaboration with Ms. Adley-SantaMaria.

Type 1 textbooks:

Goode (1985),* High School level.
Johnson et al. (n.d.), Kindergarten level.

Both of these are excellent for teaching speakers to read and write as well as something about the grammar, but they would not be appropriate for non-speak-

[1]In part a German translation of Goosen (1977).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ers. Incidentally, it should be noted that Western Apache, like most other Native languages of the United States, has quite a few short booklets or pamphlets that teach children or adults to read and write. These are not language textbooks, and are not appropriate for non-speakers. A complete list of such materials is:

Antonio et al. (1983)
Edgerton & Hill (1958)
Steele, Smith, & Bunney (n.d.a)
Steele, Smith, & Bunney (n.d.b)
White Mountain Apache Culture Center (1972)
White Mountain Apache Culture Center (1983)
Wycliffe Bible Translators (n.d.)

Type 2 textbooks:
Casey et al. (1994), Head Start level.

This last work teaches about seventy-seven words in the context of four simple sentence frames:

This is a _____.
Is this a _____?
No, this is a _____.
Yes, this is a _____.

Such contents might be appropriate for Head Start, but not for any other purposes.

Type 3 textbooks:
de Reuse (1994)*

This last work was developed for a University-level class for linguistics students, as well as Navajo and Apache educators, and was used at the American Indian Language Development Institute in June 1994 at the University of Arizona in Tucson. Speakers generally liked it, but it was a somewhat strange mix of very simple conversations with very complex linguistic explanations. It could hardly be called a language teaching instrument.

To conclude, Western Apache might be the only major Native language of the Southwest with no Type 2 textbooks at all for the adult level, and with no Type 3 textbooks for any level.

An introductory White Mountain Apache textbook

Ms. Adley-SantaMaria and I decided to remedy the situation described in the previous paragraph by collaborating on a Type 3 textbook for non-speakers of Western Apache. We decided on a Type 3 textbook for the reasons below:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. Could be used by non-speakers;
2. Designed for high school and university levels who can benefit from some grammar instruction (Odlin, 1994); and
3. Existence of several successful models of Type 3 textbooks; we used Wilson's *Conversational Navajo Workbook* (1995) and Zepeda's *Papago Grammar* (1983) as models.

The result is our *Ndee biyáti' bígoch'il'aah (Learning Apache): An introductory textbook in the White Mountain Apache language for non-speakers* (de Reuse & Adley-SantaMaria, 1996). In addition to the body of thirty lessons that have been completed, the final version will contain two introductions, one by myself and one by Ms. Adley-SantaMaria, acknowledgments, a pronunciation and spelling section, a glossary, an index, and a paradigms appendix. We used Wilson (1995) as a model for the first 20 Lessons. The lessons are written around grammatical topics (such as locatives and possession) or around communicative topics (such as health and body part terms), and the approach is basically in the grammar-translation tradition. Each lesson has a vocabulary list and extensive grammatical explanation with illustrative sentences. The exercises are predominantly in the shape of sentences to be translated into English. In order to make the work more communicatively relevant, the sentences to be translated are usually in the form of question-response dyads.[4] Our collaboration on this text raised a variety of ideological, practical, and cultural issues.

Ideological issues

While the main purpose of our text is to teach elementary conversational Western Apache with some emphasis on reading and writing, I also wanted it to be used to teach some of the linguistics of Western Apache to Apache students and speakers. In the next paragraphs, I explain the usefulness of linguistics to Apache speakers. Ms. Adley-SantaMaria will also address some of these issues in her own presentation in this volume.

Linguistics is the scientific study of human language. To the layperson, linguistics often seems boring because it bears some resemblance to grammar. Everyone remembers English grammar from their elementary school or high school years, and nobody liked it. The problem with traditional English grammar is that it did not seem to have a point, or maybe the only point was that it told you what was "good" English and what was "bad" English, without really explaining why. Linguistics tries to be a more responsible study of grammar, in three ways. First, it tries to explain why things are the way they are, by trying to discover general rules but recognizing that sometimes an explanation has not (yet) been found. Second, it tries to accurately describe the way people speak, without unduly worrying whether a particular utterance is "correct" or "incorrect." Third, linguistics is not committed to a particular language. Language is a universally human faculty, and linguistics is the study of what all languages have in common and in which direction and to what extent they vary.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

There are many educators who might be anxious to find out what they will learn from the linguistics in this text and how it will be useful for their students on the reservation. In my opinion, there are three basic ways in which linguistics can be useful to Native American educators. First, most educators interested in the contents of this text deal with bilingual situations, i.e. situations where both the Native language and English are used. In such situations, one obviously becomes aware of the differences between languages. Part of linguistics is a subfield called contrastive linguistics (sometimes erroneously called comparative linguistics, which should be reserved for the subfield that compares languages in order to determine their common historical origin). Contrastive linguistics compares one or more languages, emphasizing the differences in linguistic structure. It allows us to explain more accurately why certain aspects of English, or of Western Apache, are hard to learn for speakers of other languages. The practical applications to the educator are obvious. Our discussions of Western Apache grammar will in effect be contrastive, since it will be assumed that English grammar is different from it in many ways. I do not know of any works on the contrastive linguistics of Western Apache and English. Ms. Adley-SantaMaria and I had to work on what our understanding of contrastive linguistics was. I would say that we had to explain a detail of Apache grammar really well, because the facts are complicated, and Ms. Adley-SantaMaria would respond, "Why? It's not complicated to me!" Indeed, what is simple and natural to a Native speaker of Apache is not necessarily simple to a Native speaker of English, and vice-versa.

Second, as pointed out by Ken Hale in several papers (n.d., 1972, 1970-1975, 1976), Native American languages form an ideal laboratory for teaching children about scientific inquiry. Native American languages have not been codified in language academies or authoritative textbooks or dictionaries, which means that children do not have preconceived ideas about what the "correct" language is. Like all speakers of a language, Native American children (who speak their own language) do of course have an intuitive, largely unconscious knowledge of the rules of the language. What the teacher can do is dialogue with the children in order to help them discover, little by little, these unconscious rules. This process of discovery by dialogue is, as Hale convincingly points out, similar to the teacher-student dialogue occurring in a physics or chemistry class and just as scientific. The only difference is that no expensive supplies are needed, just a chalkboard and the children's native speaker intuitions. Thus, linguistics can be a tool for teaching the principles of scientific inquiry. In order to use linguistics this way, educators themselves need to know something about the linguistic structure of their languages. Ms. Adley-SantaMaria was not convinced of this need, and I see her point, because it is precisely the children who are rapidly losing their native competence and acquire, at best, a passive knowledge of Apache. A passive knowledge is certainly not as good as an active knowledge for the purpose of discovering unconscious rules.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The third and final motivation for teaching linguistics is to get Native American students interested in the field. It has been pointed out several times (for example in Hale, 1972) that Native American Linguistics has been a Euro-American type of venture. The Euro-American person comes to a reservation, identifies a "vanishing Indian language" to be rescued from "oblivion," describes it, and gets substantial academic recognition for his or her publications. The language is rescued from "oblivion," yes, but only in the form of scholarly books, to be found on the shelves of museums and research libraries. During that time, the language might well suffer conditions of oppression and become extinct among the people who spoke it. It is no surprise, then, that some reservation communities are resentful of linguists, who come in, do their research, leave, and achieve recognition thanks to data provided by members of the community but do not do anything that would benefit that community. Therefore, the more Native Americans gain an understanding of what linguistics can do for their communities, the easier it will be for them to prevent this type of exploitative situation and identify ways in which linguistics can benefit their communities.

Obviously, linguists should be careful of trying too hard to get Native American students interested in linguistics. There will never be as much money in linguistics as there is in law or medicine, and the study of linguistics, like baseball or square-dancing, is definitely a matter of taste. Some love it; some don't. Nevertheless, I am convinced that the field of Native American linguistics will progress substantially if only a few more Native American students develop a taste for it. Educators should be ready to recognize such students when they spring up. Obviously, I encourage Native speakers to become linguists, so that they could go on and develop materials on their own.

I realize that some people might feel there is something politically incorrect about collaborating with a native speaker, rather than let him/her do it by him/herself. Since Ms. Adley-SantaMaria's field is not linguistics, we had to work together. Considering the endangerment of the language, I do not think it is a good idea to wait for an Apache linguist to graduate before writing a textbook. Note also that the only other existing Apache textbook, which is on Jicarilla Apache of New Mexico, was written with a similar sort of collaboration (Wilson & Vigil Martine, 1996).

Practical and cultural issues

On a more practical plane, Ms. Adley-SantaMaria and I had our disagreements about explaining complex morphology without presupposing a lot of linguistic knowledge on the part of the learner; we compromised and will continue doing so. For example, I agreed on not attempting to explain the subject prefixes that must occur in the verb. The morphological and morphophonological facts involved are just too complex. On the other hand, I would still like to keep my discussion of the object prefixes that occur in transitive verbs. The grammar of the object prefixes is still not simple, but they are easier to learn to recognize than the subject prefixes. I prefer this approach to that of Wilson and

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Vigil Martine (1996) who do not discuss verb prefixes, except for three passing mentions on pages 35, 87, and 104 and a discussion of distributive plural da(a)- on pages 76 and 108, which must leave the moderately inquisitive learner rather curious.

Our collaboration was absolutely crucial in avoiding structures with culturally sensitive connotations, even though some of these would have been useful for purposes of grammatical illustration. We decided to avoid anything having to do with sex and bodily functions, drug and alcohol abuse, child and spousal abuse, witchcraft, and traditional religious beliefs. Certain details of clan nomenclature were also avoided. Consider the example sentences below:

Hat'ii baa nadaa?
What are you doing?/ What are you busy with?
Shiyoo' baa nashaa.
I am doing my beading.
Doo shaa nadaa da.
Don't bother me.
Naa naghaa.
S/he is bothering you.

All these seem nice examples of the construction with the postposition P-aa and the verb of motion nashaa/nadaa/naghaa. There are two usages to this construction: the object of a postposition P-aa can be a thing, as in the first two sentences or the object of the postposition can be a human being. The usage exemplified in the last two sentences is problematic in that some people might be made uncomfortable by the sexual connotations they attach to it, so we are considering taking it out. However, we do want to retain the usage exemplified by the first two sentences above.

The last ten lessons of the text are conversations on everyday topics with interlinear translations and detailed lexical and grammatical notes inspired by (but not translated from) the section on conversations in Zepeda (1983, pp. 43-154). The conversations in these lessons were originally composed for me by two Apache educators from San Carlos, and then translated into the White Mountain dialect by Ms. Adley-SantaMaria and myself. In so doing we had to make sure the place names were relevant and had to create Apache proper names that are realistic enough, while avoiding references to a real individual.

Finally, it should be noted that I never attempted to create any Apache sentences or conversations by myself for the text, and I am happy I never tried to do that, since I would have been responsible for quite a few linguistic and cultural blunders. I always used sentences given by Ms. Adley-SantaMaria or by other speakers I had worked with earlier. If the sentences came from other speakers, Ms. Adley-SantaMaria would sometimes say, "You can't say it this way!," which just shows how much dialectal and stylistic variation there exists within Western Apache.

A guide to teaching Apache with TPR

Another text I was instrumental in helping produce is Goode (1996), which is not close to final shape. It is a translation of most of the sentences given in Asher's (1982) teacher's guidebook and, when my own commentary is integrated into it, will function as a fairly comprehensive guide to teaching Apache with the Total Physical Response (TPR) method. The sentences were translated into the San Carlos variant of Western Apache by Philip Goode and were also recorded on cassette tape. Some problems already identified are the following.

The TPR method relies heavily, especially in the beginning of a course, on commands. English has a very simple verb form to express commands: it is basically the verb stem. However, for commands, Apache uses an inflected verb form, which has to be inflected for second person singular, dual, or plural. Therefore, the listener will have to hear three different commands and interpret them correctly as singular, dual, or plural, whereas English will have the same verb form, regardless of whether the command is given to one, two, or three or more people. An Apache example is given below:

Hiziį.	Stand up.
Holsiį.	Stand up (to two people).
Daholsiį.	Stand up (to three or more people).

The TPR method relies heavily on giving, putting down, and picking up objects, which in Apache are translated by thirteen classificatory handling verbs (not counting verbs of throwing and dropping), a rich and subtle system which would place an unreasonable burden on the beginning learner if it was exclusively taught through TPR. With Witherspoon et al. (1986), I agree that using TPR with classificatory handling verbs is very useful for review and reinforcement, but I would not advise teaching them through TPR only, as this would take almost thirteen times as long as teaching the English equivalents.

Finally, TPR relies heavily on touching and pointing activities, which are often culturally inappropriate for Apaches. Thus, it would be unwise, to use commands such as those below, all translated from Asher (1982):

Miguel, Ana bidan bidanłchíid.
Miguel, touch Ana's ears.
José, Rita bigan nánłs'įhdí' bichcįh hits'įh.
Jose, hit Rita on the arm and pinch her nose.
Bits'in bich'ʃ danłchiid.
Point to her head.

Notwithstanding these serious shortcomings, the TPR sentences revealed quite a few interesting and useful constructions which were not covered by the *Ndee biyáti' bígoch'iɬ'aah* text discussed earlier.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Conclusions and recommendations

We suggest that the problems posed by the two preliminary Apache texts we discussed can be partially solved by a judicious combination of the two approaches. For example, the classificatory handling verbs are best taught by a grammar-translation method, supplemented by TPR style exercises. Straightforward syntactic structures (at least in Apache), such as negation and yes-no questions, can be taught through TPR exercises and supplemented by grammatical explanations.

Native experts should monitor any text to avoid culturally sensitive or politically inappropriate material. Finally, a dialogue between linguists and native experts needs to be established, in order to decide how much linguistic terminology can be handled in each particular curriculum.

One criticism I anticipate of this paper is that I am not aware of all the unpublished materials that have been developed, and such unpublished materials might have thought of everything mentioned above. This might well be true and brings us to an important recurring problem. Many educators and textbook developers, notwithstanding a symposium such as this one, still work in too much isolation and are shy of sharing their materials with others, partly for fear that they will be criticized and partly for fear that they will be plagiarized or used for the wrong purposes. But in these times of urgent need for language renewal, the need to share should be more important than fear of criticism, and U.S. copyright laws protect one well against plagiarism. So, sharing unpublished materials, with due caution of course, should be encouraged.

I have one last recommendation for Apache and other Athabaskan textbook developers: use pedagogical materials for Navajo as models, after securing the proper permissions. Navajo is not so close to Apache that you won't have any work left, but it is a lot easier to develop materials departing from Navajo textbooks than it is when you depart from English, Spanish, French, or even Cherokee textbooks. We loosely based our textbook on Wilson (1995) with his permission. Wilson and Vigil Martine (1996) based their Jicarilla Apache textbook on Wilson's textbooks on Navajo (1969, 1978), so this a method that gets results.

References

Antonio, Toni; Danford, Ellen; Tenijieth, Mary Lou; Tessay, Mary Ann; & Hill, Faith. (1983). *Nohwiyati'* (Our Language). Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Asher, James, J. (1982). *Learning another language through actions. The complete teacher's guidebook.* Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks.

Blair, W.; Simmons, Leon; & Witherspoon, Gary. (1969). *Navajo Basic Course.*

Casey, Imogene; Kenton, Esther Mae; Victor, Valerie; Stanley, Carlotta; Dillon, Cecelia; & Kitcheyan, Kathleen. (1994). *The San Carlos Apache Tribe Project Head Start Apache Language Program.* San Carlos, AZ: San Carlos Apache Tribe, Project Head Start.

Edgerton, Faye E., & Hill, Faith. (1958). *Primers I, II.* Glendale, AZ.

Faltz, Leonard. (1993). *The Navajo verb.* Unpublished manuscript, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Arizona State University.

Goode, Phillip. (1985). *Apache language course and lesson plans for Globe High School.* Grades 9-12. Unpublished manuscript, San Carlos, AZ.

Goode, Phillip. (1996). *Total physical response sentences from Asher (1982) translated into San Carlos Apache, with commentary by Willem J. de Reuse.* Unpublished manuscript.

Goossen, Irvy W. (1977). *Navajo made easier.* Flagstaff, AZ: Northland.

Goossen, Irvy W. (1995). *Diné bizaad: Speak, read, write Navajo.* Flagstaff, AZ: Salina Bookshelf.

Haile, Fr. Berard. (1941-1948). *Learning Navaho.* Vols. I-IV. St. Michaels, AZ: St. Michael's Mission.

Hale, Kenneth L. (n.d.) *Linguistics and local languages in a science curriculum for bilingual/bicultural programs.* Unpublished paper, MIT.

Hale, Kenneth L. (1972). Some questions about anthropological linguistics: The role of Native knowledge. In Dell Hymes (Ed.) *Reinventing anthropology* (pp. 382-397). New York: Random House.

Hale, Kenneth L. (1970-1975). *Navajo linguistics:* Parts I-IV. Unpublished manuscripts, MIT.

Hale, Kenneth L. (1976). Theoretical linguistics in relation to American Indian communities. In Wallace Chafe (Ed.), *American Indian languages and American linguistics* (pp. 35-50). Lisse: Peter de Ridder.

Hale, Kenneth L.; Tsosie-Perkins, Ellavina; Demers, Richard; & Shank, Dorothy. (1977). *Structure of Navajo.* Unpublished class notes. Department of Linguistics, University of Arizona.

Johnson, James B.; Lavender, Bonnie; Malone, Beverley; Bead, Christina; & Clawson, Curry. (n. d.). *Yátiᶏ'nakih. Two Languages. Kindergarten Bi Naltsoos choh. Kindergarten's Big Book.* Title VII Bilingual Education Program Kindergarten Curriculum Manual. Fort Apache, Arizona: White Mountain Apache Tribe.

Kalectaca, Milo, & Langacker, Ronald. (1978). *Lessons in Hopi.* Tucson: University of Arizona.

Lewis, Bonnie. (1989). *K-3 Apache Language Assessment.* Whiteriver, Arizona: Whiteriver Unified School District.

Masayesva-Jeanne, LaVerne, & Hale, Kenneth L. (1976). *Hopi workshop materials.* Unpublished manuscript, Department of Linguistics, University of Arizona.

Molina, Felipe. (1995). *Conversational Yoeme.* Unpublished manuscript.

Odlin, Terrence. (Ed.) (1994). *Perspectives on pedagogical grammar.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Pinnow, Heinz-Juergen. (1974). *Diné Bizaad Bídahwii'aah: Wir lernen Navajo.* Manuscript No. 80/16070. Lateinamerika-Institut at the Free University of Berlin.

Platero, Paul R.; Legah, Lorene; & Platero, Linda S. (1985). *Dinée Bizaad Bee Na'adzo: A Navajo language, literacy and grammar text.* Farmington: The Navajo Language Institute.

de Reuse, Willem. (1987). One hundred years of Lakota linguistics. *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics, 12,* 13-42.

de Reuse, Willem. (1990). A supplementary bibliography of Lakota language and linguistics. *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics, 15,*146-165.

de Reuse, Willem. (1994). *An introduction to Western Apache linguistics* (3 vols.). Unpublished manuscript, Department of Anthropology, University of Arizona.

de Reuse, Willem, & Adley-SantaMaria, Bernadette. (1996). *Ndee biyáti' bígoch'il'aah (Learning Apache): An introductory textbook in the White Mountain Apache language for non-speakers.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Arizona.

de Reuse, Willem, & Goode, Phillip. (1996). *Nnee biyati' yánłti'go (Speak Apaçhe):* An introductory textbook in the San Carlos Apache language for non-speakers. Unpublished manuscript, University of Arizona.

Sekaquaptewa Emory, & Hill, Kenneth. (1995. *Hopi language in culture.* Bureau of Applied Research in Anthropology, Department of Anthropology, University of Arizona. (revised every year).

Sekaquaptewa Emory, & Shaul, David L. (1974-1977). *An introduction to conversational Hopi with grammar units.* Unpublished manuscript, Department of Anthropology, University of Arizona.

Steele, Lola; Smith, Dorothy; & Bunney, Curtis. (n.d.a). *Nnee Díí Kehgo Daagoliç!iç!" Ni'* (Apaches used to live this way). San Carlos, AZ: Rice School District No. 20.

Steele, Lola; Smith, Dorothy; & Bunney, Curtis. (n.d.b). *Oshíí Bígonsh'aa (I learn to read).* San Carlos, AZ: Rice School District No. 20.

White Mountain Apache Culture Center. (1972). *Keys to reading and writing Apache.* Fort Apache, AZ: Author.

White Mountain Apache Culture Center. (1983). *New keys to reading and writing Apache.* Fort Apache, AZ: Author.

Willenbrink, Antonine, O.F.M. (1935). *Notes on the Pima Indian language.* Santa Barbara, CA: The Franciscan Fathers of California.

Willie, Mary. (1994). *Navajo language course.* Department of Linguistics, University of Arizona. (revised every year).

Wilson, Alan. (1969). *Breakthrough Navajo. An introductory course.* Gallup, NM: The University of New Mexico, Gallup Branch.

Wilson, Alan, & Dennison, Gene. (1978). *Speak Navajo. An intermediate text in communication.* Gallup, NM: University of New Mexico, Gallup Branch.

Wilson, Alan, & Martine, Rita Vigil. (1996). *Apache.* Guilford, CN: Audio-Forum.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Wilson, Garth A. (1995). *Conversational Navajo workbook. An introductory course for non-native speakers.* Blanding, UT: Conversational Navajo Publications.

Witherspoon, Gary; Slate, Clay; Becenti, Andrew; & Hamilton, Mary. (1985). *Diné Bizaad Bóhoo'aah for secondary schools, colleges and adults.* Farmington, NM: Navajo Language Institute.

Witherspoon, Gary; Platero, Paul; Slate, Clay; Lawrence, Nancy; Becenti, Andrew; & Hamilton, Mary. (1986). *Diné Bizaad Bóhoo'aah II. A conversational Navajo text for secondary schools, colleges and adults.* Farmington, New Mexico: Navajo Language Institute.

Wycliffe Bible Translators. (n. d.). *Apache reader.* Wycliffe Bible Translators.

Zepeda, Ofelia. (1983). *A Papago grammar.* Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE